

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/702,083	FOCKE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Barbara J. Musser	1733	

**All Participants:**

(1) Barbara J. Musser.

(2) John Mion.

**Status of Application:** Rejected

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 1 February 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*none*

**Claims discussed:**

*15*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*Vijuk '931 and Vijuk '195*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated applicant's argument were not convincing. Examiner suggested that applicant amend the claims to more clearly distinguish the differences between applicant's invention and the problems applicant indicated are present in Vijuk '195 such as the lack of stabilization during transport. Examiner suggested that applicant amend the claims to only one folding process or that the steps occur immediately after one another so that only one folding process is present since applicant argues one problem with Vijuk '195 is the two separate folding processes. Examiner suggested applicant amend the claims to indicate the folding only occurs in the longitudinal direction as Vijuk '195 is primarily directed to folding transversely. .